

PATENTREMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the subject application as amended herein. This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on April 15, 2003.

Applicant affirms the provisional election made by James C. Scheller on 3/4/03 electing group II (claims 15-23 and 27). Claims 1-14, 24-26, and 28 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 15-23 and 27 are rejected.

New Claim 29 has been added.

No new matter has been added by this amendment.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 15-21, 23 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Duthaler, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,312,304, hereinafter "Duthaler") in view of Falls, (WO Patent No. 97/05556, hereinafter "Falls"). The claims 15-21, 23 and 27 are not obvious under Duthaler in view of Falls because none of these references suggested, taught, or motivated the use of blocks deposited onto a flexible substrate wherein the each block drives a picture element.

Applicant respectfully submits that Duthaler is unrelated to the invention as claimed in claims 15-21, 23, and 27. Duthaler is not dealing with blocks being deposited onto a flexible substrate. Duthaler deals with an assembly that has 3 layers, a modulating layer, a pixel layer, and a circuit layer adhered together to form an electronic display. (Col. 1, lines 55-64).

PATENT

The modulating layer includes a first substrate and an electro-optical material provided adjacent the first substrate. The modulating layer is capable of changing a visual state upon application of an electric field. (Col. 1, lines 57-60). In particular, the modulating layer includes substrate 12, a common electrode 16, and display media 14 which includes microcapsules 18. (Col. 3, lines 44-64). Contrary to the Examiner's misunderstanding, the microcapsules 18 are not blocks that include a circuit element that drives a picture element. The microcapsules 18 are part of the display media 14. The microcapsules 18 do not drive picture elements. The substrate 12 of Duthaler thus does not include blocks that drive picture elements as claimed in Applicant's claims 15-21, 23 and 27.

The pixel layer comprises a second substrate 23 and a plurality of pixel electrodes 24 provided on the substrate 23. Each pixel electrodes is connected to a contact pad. (Col., 4, lines 1-11). There is also no block deposited onto the substrate 23 that can drive a pixel element.

The circuit layer includes a third substrate and at least one circuit element. In particular, the circuit layer includes a substrate 41, pixel electrode contacts 42, and pixel circuitry and logic 44. This is the only circuit layer of the device discussed in Duthaler. However, the circuit 44 is not included within a block that is deposited onto the substrate.

Therefore, Duthaler did not discuss a substrate that has a plurality of blocks deposited thereon wherein each of the blocks comprises a circuit element to drive a picture element.

Falls dealt with an automatic strategy of obtaining product information such as real-time information display, dynamic printed information display, and shelf-space management (Falls, page 9, lines 18-24). Falls did not deal with a receiver coupling to any block, much less a plurality of blocks that are deposited onto a flexible substrate and coupling to a receiver. Falls mentioned a differential receiver 184 that converts the differential data signals

PATENT

on two conductors of a standard CMOS (Falls, page 27, lines 4-11). Falls did not suggest, teach, or motivate the coupling of the receiver to blocks that are deposited onto a flexible substrate.

Thus, Duthaler and Falls, alone or in combination, cannot make obvious claims 15-21, 23 and 27. Applicant thus respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claims 22 is was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Duthaler, and Falls, as applied to claims 15-21, etc. and further in view of Bischel, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,664,032, hereinafter "Bischel").

As mentioned above, Duthaler did not discuss a substrate that has a plurality of blocks deposited thereon wherein each of the blocks comprises a circuit element to drive a picture element. Bischel cannot be combined into Duthaler to make obvious a flexible display panel the comprises upconverting phosphor and a plurality of blocks deposited onto a flexible substrate with each block having a circuit element that drives a picture element as claimed in claim 22.

Thus, Duthaler, Falls, and Bischel, alone or in combination, cannot make obvious claim 22. Applicant thus respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

The newly added claim 29 depends from claim 15 and is thus similarly not made obvious under Duthaler and Falls. In addition, claim 29 specifies that the receiver is deposited onto the same flexible layer that the blocks are deposited on. This feature is not taught, motivated, or suggested in Duthaler, Falls, or Bischel.

PATENTCONCLUSION

As discussed above, the pending claims are patentable over the above reference.

Deposit Account Authorization


Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due. Furthermore, if an extension is required, then Applicant hereby requests such extension.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Mimi Diemmy Dao at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR
& ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: July 15, 2003


Mimi Diemmy Dao
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 45,628

Customer No. 008791
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8598